

Arcs in the Plane*

Joan E. Hart[†] and Kenneth Kunen^{‡§}

June 15, 2009

Abstract

Assuming PFA, every uncountable subset E of the plane meets some C^1 arc in an uncountable set. This is not provable from $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$, although in the case that E is analytic, this is a ZFC result. The result is false in ZFC for C^2 arcs, and the counter-example is a perfect set.

1 Introduction

As usual, an *arc* in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a set homeomorphic to a closed bounded subinterval of $\mathbb{R}$. A (simple) *path* is a homeomorphism g mapping a compact interval onto A . For $k \geq 1$, a path is C^k iff it is a C^k function, and an arc A is C^k iff A is the image of some C^k path g , with $g'(t) \neq 0$ for all t ; equivalently, A has a C^k arc length parameterization. Also, A is C^∞ iff it is C^k for all k . We consider the following:

Question. For $n \geq 2$, if $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is uncountable, must there be a “nice” arc A such that $E \cap A$ is uncountable?

Obviously, the answer will depend on the definition of “nice”. We should expect ZFC results for closed E (equivalently, for analytic E), and independence results for arbitrary E . In general, under CH things are as bad as possible, and under PFA, things are as good as possible. In most cases, the results are the same for all $n \geq 2$, and trivial for $n = 1$.

For arbitrary arcs, the results are quite old. In ZFC, every closed uncountable set meets some arc in an uncountable set. For $n \geq 2$, arcs are nowhere dense in $\mathbb{R}^n$; so under CH there is a Luzin set that meets every arc in a countable set. At

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 03E50, 03E65, 53A04. Key Words and Phrases: arc, smooth, PFA, MA.

[†]University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, WI 54901, U.S.A., hartj@uwosh.edu

[‡]University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, U.S.A., kunen@math.wisc.edu

[§]Both authors partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-0456653.

the other extreme, under $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$, every uncountable $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ meets some arc in an uncountable set.

If “nice” means “straight line”, then there is a trivial counter-example: a perfect set E which meets every line in at most two points.

Paper [3] introduces results where “nice” means “almost straight”:

Definition 1.1 *Let $\rho : \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow S^{n-1}$ be the perpendicular retraction given by $\rho(x) = x/\|x\|$. Then $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is ε -directed iff for some $v \in S^{n-1}$, $\|\rho(x-y) - v\| \leq \varepsilon$ or $\|\rho(x-y) + v\| \leq \varepsilon$ whenever x, y are distinct points of A .*

The retraction $\rho(x-y)$ may be viewed as the *direction* from y to x . Every $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is trivially $\sqrt{2}$ -directed, and A is 0-directed iff A is contained in a straight line. If “nice” means “ ε -directed”, a counter-example to the Question is consistent with $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$. By [3], the existence of a *weakly* Luzin set is consistent with $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$, and whenever $\varepsilon < \sqrt{2}$, a weakly Luzin set (see [3] Definition 2.4) meets every ε -directed set in a countable set. However, under SOCA, which follows from PFA, whenever $\varepsilon > 0$, every uncountable set meets some ε -directed arc in an uncountable set (see Lemma 4.1). Every C^1 arc is a finite union of ε -directed arcs, and hence we get the stronger:

Theorem 1.2 *PFA implies that every uncountable subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ meets some C^1 arc in an uncountable set.*

$\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ is not sufficient for this theorem, because, as in the ε -directed case ($\varepsilon < \sqrt{2}$), a weakly Luzin set provides a counter-example. Theorem 1.2 and the following ZFC theorem for closed sets are proved in Section 4.

Theorem 1.3 *If $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is closed and uncountable, then there is a C^1 arc A with a Cantor set $Q \subseteq P \cap A$. Hence, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, P meets some ε -directed arc in an uncountable set.*

If the Question asks for a C^2 arc, then a ZFC counter-example exists in the plane, and hence in any $\mathbb{R}^n$ ($n \geq 2$). The counter-example, given in Theorem 1.5, is a *non-squiggly* subset of the plane. A simple example of a non-squiggly set is a C^1 arc whose tangent vector either always rotates clockwise or always rotates counter-clockwise. In particular, such an arc may be the graph of a convex function $f \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R})$; a real differentiable function is *convex* iff its derivative is a monotonically increasing function. But non-squiggly makes sense for non-smooth arcs, and in fact for arbitrary subsets of the plane:

Definition 1.4 *$A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ is non-squiggly iff there is a δ , with $0 < \delta \leq \infty$, such that whenever $\{x, y, z, t\} \in [A]^4$ and $\text{diam}(\{x, y, z, t\}) \leq \delta$, point t is not interior to triangle xyz .*

Theorem 1.5 *There is a perfect non-squiggly set $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ which lies in a C^1 arc A and which meets each C^2 arc in a finite set. Moreover, the C^1 arc A may be taken to be the graph of a convex function.*

As “nice” notions, non-squiggly is orthogonal to smooth:

Theorem 1.6 *There is a perfect set $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ which lies in a C^∞ arc and which meets every non-squiggly set in a countable set.*

Note that by Ramsey’s Theorem, every infinite set in $\mathbb{R}^2$ has an infinite non-squiggly subset.

In Definition 1.4, allowing $\delta < \infty$ makes non-squiggly a local notion; so, piecewise linear arcs and some spirals (such as $r = \theta$; $0 \leq \theta < \infty$) are non-squiggly. However, the results of this paper would be unchanged if we simply required $\delta = \infty$. For $0 < \delta \leq \infty$, if $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ meets a non-squiggly set A in an uncountable set, then E has uncountable intersection with a subset of A whose diameter is at most δ .

The proof of Theorem 1.5 uses the assumption that each C^2 arc is parameterized by some g whose derivative is nowhere 0. Dropping this requirement on g' yields a weaker notion of C^∞ , and a different result. Call a C^k arc *strongly* C^k , and say that an arc is *weakly* C^k iff it is the image of a C^k path. Then, an arc is weakly C^∞ iff it is weakly C^k for all k .

Theorem 1.7 *If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is bounded and infinite, then it meets some weakly C^∞ arc in an infinite set.*

Theorems 1.5 and 1.6 are proved in Section 5; Theorem 1.7 and some related facts are proved in Section 6.

2 Remarks on Hermite Splines

We construct the arc of Theorem 1.3 by first producing a “nice” Cantor set $Q \subseteq P$. Then we apply results, described in this section, that make it possible to draw a smooth curve through a closed set. These results are a natural extension of results of Hermite for drawing a curve through a finite set. Our proof of Theorem 1.3 reduces the problem to the case where $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is the graph of a function with domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}$; then we extend this function to all of $\mathbb{R}$ to produce the desired arc.

First consider the case $|D| = 2$, or interpolation on an interval $[a_1, a_2]$; we find $f \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ with predetermined values b_1, b_2 and slopes s_1, s_2 at a_1, a_2 , and we bound f, f' on $[a_1, a_2]$ in terms of the *three* slopes: $s := (b_2 - b_1)/(a_2 - a_1)$, and s_1, s_2 . Following Hermite, f will be the natural cubic interpolation function. Our bounds show that if s, s_1, s_2 are all close to each other, then f is close to the linear interpolation function L .

Lemma 2.1 *Given s_1, s_2, b_1, b_2 and $a_1 < a_2$, let $s = (b_2 - b_1)/(a_2 - a_1)$, and let $L(x) = b_1 + s(x - a_1)$. Let $M = \max(|s_1 - s|, |s_2 - s|)$. Then there is a cubic f with each $f(a_i) = b_i$ and each $f'(a_i) = s_i$, such that*

1. $|(f(x_2) - f(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1) - s| \leq 3M$ whenever $a_1 \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq a_2$.

Moreover, for all $x \in [a_1, a_2]$:

2. $|f'(x) - s| \leq 3M$.
3. $|f(x) - L(x)| \leq 2M(a_2 - a_1)$.

Proof. (1) follows from (2) and the Mean Value Theorem. Now, let

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= L(x) + \beta_2(x - a_1)^2(x - a_2) + \beta_1(x - a_1)(x - a_2)^2 \\ f'(x) &= s + \beta_2(x - a_1)^2 + \beta_1(x - a_2)^2 + 2(\beta_2 + \beta_1)(x - a_1)(x - a_2) \end{aligned}$$

Then $f(a_i) = b_i$ is obvious, and setting $\beta_i = (s_i - s)/(a_2 - a_1)^2$ we get $f'(a_i) = s_i$. To see (2) and (3), note that $|\beta_i| \leq M/(a_2 - a_1)^2$, and $(x - a_1)(a_2 - x) \leq (a_2 - a_1)^2/4$ (the maximum of $(x - a_1)(a_2 - x)$ occurs at the midpoint $x = \frac{a_1 + a_2}{2}$). ☕

Next, we consider extending, to all of $\mathbb{R}$, a C^1 function defined on a closed $D \subset \mathbb{R}$. First note that there are two possible meanings for “ $f \in C^1(D)$ ”:

Definition 2.2 *Assume that $f, h \in C(D, \mathbb{R})$, where D is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Then $f' = h$ in the strong sense iff*

$$\forall x \in D \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x_1, x_2 \in D \left[x_1 \neq x_2 \ \& \ |x_1 - x|, |x_2 - x| < \delta \implies \left| \frac{f(x_2) - f(x_1)}{x_2 - x_1} - h(x) \right| < \varepsilon \right] .$$

The usual or weak sense would only require this with x_1 replaced by the point x . When D is an interval, the two senses are equivalent by the continuity of h and the Mean Value Theorem. Note that $f' = h$ in the strong sense iff there is a $g \in C(D \times D, \mathbb{R})$ such that $g(x, x) = h(x)$ for each x and $g(x_1, x_2) = g(x_2, x_1) = (f(x_2) - f(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1)$ whenever $x_1 \neq x_2$.

If D is finite, then $f' = h$ in the strong sense for *any* $f, h : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and the cubic Hermite spline is an $\tilde{f} \in C^1(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ with $\tilde{f}|_D = f$ and $\tilde{f}'|_D = h$. The following lemma generalizes this to an arbitrary closed D :

Lemma 2.3 *Assume that $f, h \in C(D, \mathbb{R})$, where D is a closed subset of $\mathbb{R}$, and $f' = h$ in the strong sense. Then there are $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h} \in C(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ such that $\tilde{f}' = \tilde{h}$, $\tilde{f} \supseteq f$, and $\tilde{h} \supseteq h$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be the collection of pairwise disjoint open intervals covering $\mathbb{R} \setminus D$. For each interval $J \in \mathcal{J}$, we shall define $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$ on J .

If J is the unbounded interval (a_1, ∞) , with $a_1 \in D$, define $\tilde{f}$ and $\tilde{h}$ by the linear $\tilde{f}(x) = f(a_1) + (x - a_1)h(a_1)$ and $\tilde{h}(x) = h(a_1)$, for $x \in J$. Then $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$ are continuous on $\bar{J}$ and $\tilde{f}' = \tilde{h}$ on J . At a_1 , the derivative of $\tilde{f}$ from the right is $h(a_1)$; the derivative of $\tilde{f}$ from the left, as well as the continuity of $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$ from the left, depend on how we extend f to the bounded intervals.

The unbounded interval $(-\infty, a_2)$ is handled likewise.

Say $J = (a_1, a_2)$, with $a_1, a_2 \in D$. On J , let $\tilde{f}$ be the cubic obtained from Lemma 2.1, with $b_i = f(a_i)$ and $s_i = h(a_i)$. Then $\tilde{h}$ is the quadratic $\tilde{f}'$ on J .

To finish, we verify that $\tilde{f}, \tilde{h}$ are continuous and $\tilde{f}' = \tilde{h}$ on $\mathbb{R}$. Fix $z \in D$. Since differentiability implies continuity, it suffices to show that $\tilde{h}$ is continuous at z , and that $h(z) = \tilde{f}'(z) = \lim_{x \rightarrow z} (\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(z))/(x - z)$. We verify the continuity of $\tilde{h}$ from the left at z , and the difference quotient's limit for x approaching z from the left; a similar argument handles these from the right. Let $\sigma = h(z) = \tilde{h}(z)$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Apply continuity of f, h on D , and the fact that $f' = h$ in the strong sense, to fix $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $z - \delta < a_1 < a_2 < z$ with $a_1, a_2 \in D$, the quantities $|s - \sigma|$, $|s_i - \sigma|$, $|b_i - f(z)|$, $|(f(a_2) - f(z))/(a_2 - z) - \sigma|$ are all less than ε , where $s_i = h(a_i)$ and $b_i = f(a_i)$, for $i = 1, 2$, and $s = (b_2 - b_1)/(a_2 - a_1)$. Let $M = \max(|s_1 - s|, |s_2 - s|)$, as in Lemma 2.1; so $M \leq 2\varepsilon$.

Assume that z is a limit from the left of points of D and of points of $\mathbb{R} \setminus D$; otherwise checking continuity and the derivative from the left is trivial. Thus, δ may be taken small enough so that $(z - \delta, z)$ misses any unbounded interval in $\mathcal{J}$. For $a_1, a_2 \in D$ with $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathcal{J}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with $z - \delta < a_1 \leq x < a_2 < z$, the bounds from Lemma 2.1 imply that $|\tilde{h}(x) - \sigma| \leq |\tilde{h}(x) - s| + |s - \sigma| \leq 3M + \varepsilon \leq 7\varepsilon$. So $\tilde{h}$ is continuous. To see that $h(z) = \tilde{f}'(z)$, observe that by elementary geometry, the slope $(\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(z))/(x - z)$ is between the slopes $(\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(a_2))/(x - a_2)$ and $(\tilde{f}(a_2) - \tilde{f}(z))/(a_2 - z)$. Applying Lemma 2.1 again, $|(\tilde{f}(x) - \tilde{f}(a_2))/(x - a_2) - \sigma| \leq 3M + \varepsilon \leq 7\varepsilon$, so we are done. ☕

3 Some Flavors of OCA

The proofs of Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 will require the results of this section.

Definition 3.1 For any set E , let $E^\dagger = (E \times E) \setminus \{(x, x) : x \in E\}$. If $W \subseteq E^\dagger$ with $W = W^{-1}$, then $T \subseteq E$ is W -free iff $T^\dagger \cap W = \emptyset$, and T is W -connected iff $T^\dagger \subseteq W$.

Then SOCA is the assertion that whenever E is an uncountable separable metric space and $W = W^{-1} \subseteq E^\dagger$ is open, there is either an uncountable W -free set or an uncountable W -connected set.

SOCA follows from PFA, but not from $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$. It clearly contradicts CH. However, it is well-known [2] that SOCA is a ZFC theorem when E is Polish:

Lemma 3.2 *Assume that E is an uncountable Polish space, $W \subseteq E^\dagger$ is open, and $W = W^{-1}$. Then there is a Cantor set $Q \subseteq E$ which is either W -free or W -connected.*

Proof. Shrinking E , we may assume that E is a Cantor set; in particular, non-empty open sets are uncountable. Assume that no Cantor subset is W -free. Since W is open, the closure of a W -free set is W -free; thus every W -free set has countable closure, and is hence nowhere dense.

Now, inductively construct a tree, $\{P_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\}$. Each P_s is a non-empty clopen subset of E , with $\text{diam}(P_s) \leq 2^{-\text{lh}(s)}$. $P_{s \smallfrown 0}$ and $P_{s \smallfrown 1}$ are disjoint subsets of P_s such that $(P_{s \smallfrown 0} \times P_{s \smallfrown 1}) \subseteq W$. Let $Q = \bigcup \{\bigcap_n P_{f \upharpoonright n} : f \in 2^\omega\}$; then Q is W -connected.



An “open covering” version of SOCA follows by induction on ℓ :

Lemma 3.3 *Let E be an uncountable separable metric space, with $E^\dagger = \bigcup_{i < \ell} W_i$, where $\ell \in \omega$ and each $W_i = W_i^{-1}$ is open in $E^\dagger$. Assuming SOCA, there is an uncountable $T \subseteq E$ such that T is W_i -connected for some i . In the case that E is Polish, this is a ZFC result and T can be made perfect.*

There is also a version of this lemma obtained by replacing the covering by a continuous function:

Lemma 3.4 *Assume that E is an uncountable Polish space, F is a compact metric space, $g \in C(E^\dagger, F)$, and $g(x, y) = g(y, x)$ whenever $x \neq y$. Then there is a Cantor set $Q \subseteq E$ such that $g \upharpoonright Q^\dagger$ extends continuously to some $\hat{g} \in C(Q \times Q, F)$.*

Proof. Construct a tree, $\{P_s : s \in 2^{<\omega}\}$. Each P_s is a Cantor subset of E , with $\text{diam}(P_s) \leq 2^{-\text{lh}(s)}$. $P_{s \smallfrown 0}$ and $P_{s \smallfrown 1}$ are disjoint subsets of P_s . Also, apply Lemma 3.3 to get $\text{diam}(g(P_s^\dagger)) \leq 2^{-\text{lh}(s)}$. Let $Q = \bigcup \{\bigcap_n P_{f \upharpoonright n} : f \in 2^\omega\}$. 

Now, to prove Theorem 1.2, we need, under PFA, a version of Lemma 3.4 where E is just an uncountable subset of a Polish space. We begin with the following, from Abraham, Rubin, and Shelah [1]:

Theorem 3.5 *Assume PFA. Then $\text{OCA}_{[\text{ARS}]}$ holds. That is, let E be a separable metric space of size $\aleph_1$. Assume that $E^\dagger = \bigcup_{i < \ell} W_i$, where $\ell \in \omega$ and each $W_i = W_i^{-1}$ is open in $E^\dagger$. Then E can be partitioned into sets $\{A_j : j \in \omega\}$ such that for each j , A_j is W_i -connected for some i .*

The terminology $\text{OCA}_{[\text{ARS}]}$ was used by Moore [4] to distinguish it from other flavors of the Open Coloring Axiom in the literature. Actually, [1] does not mention PFA, but rather its Theorem 3.1 shows, by iterated ccc forcing, that $\text{OCA}_{[\text{ARS}]}$ is consistent with $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$; but the same proof shows that it is true under PFA. In our proof of Theorem 1.2, we only need $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$ plus $\text{OCA}_{[\text{ARS}]}$, so in fact every model of $2^{\aleph_0} = \aleph_1 \wedge 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$ has a ccc extension satisfying the result of Theorem 1.2.

To use $\text{OCA}_{[\text{ARS}]}$ for our version of Lemma 3.4, we need the A_j of Theorem 3.5 to be clopen. This is not always possible, but can be achieved if we shrink E :

Lemma 3.6 *Assume $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$. Assume that X is a Polish space and $E \in [X]^{\aleph_1}$. For each $n \in \omega$, let $\{A_j^n : j \in \omega\}$ partition E into $\aleph_0$ sets. Then there is a Cantor set $Q \subseteq X$ and, for each n , a partition of Q into disjoint relatively clopen sets $\{K_j^n : j \in \omega\}$ such that $|Q \cap E| = \aleph_1$ and each $K_j^n \cap E = A_j^n \cap Q$.*

Proof. Note that for each n , compactness of Q implies that all but finitely many of the K_j^n will be empty.

For $s \in \omega^{<\omega}$, let $A_s = \bigcap \{A_{s(n)}^n : n < \text{lh}(s)\}$, with $A_\emptyset = E$. Shrinking E, X , we may assume that whenever $U \subseteq X$ is open and non-empty, $|E \cap U| = \aleph_1$ and each $|A_s \cap U|$ is either 0 or $\aleph_1$.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a countable open base for X , with $X \in \mathcal{B}$. Call $\mathcal{T}$ a *nice tree* iff:

1. $\mathcal{T}$ is a non-empty subset of $\mathcal{B} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ which is a tree under the order $\subset$, with root node X .
2. $\mathcal{T}$ has height $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$, where $1 \leq \text{ht}(\mathcal{T}) \leq \omega$.
3. If $U \in \mathcal{T}$ is at level ℓ with $\ell + 1 < \text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$, then U has finitely many but at least two children in $\mathcal{T}$, and the closures of the children are pairwise disjoint and contained in U .
4. If $U \in \mathcal{T}$ is at level $\ell > 0$, then $\text{diam}(U) \leq 1/\ell$.

This labels the levels $0, 1, 2, \dots$, with $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T})$ the first empty level. Let $L_\ell(\mathcal{T})$ be the set of nodes at level ℓ . By (1)–(3), each $L_\ell(\mathcal{T})$ is a finite pairwise disjoint collection.

When $\text{ht}(\mathcal{T}) = \omega$, let $Q_{\mathcal{T}} = \bigcap_{\ell \in \omega} \bigcup L_\ell(\mathcal{T}) = \bigcap_{\ell \in \omega} \text{cl}(\bigcup L_\ell(\mathcal{T}))$. Then $Q_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a Cantor set, so it is natural to force with finite trees approximating $\mathcal{T}$. Since many Cantor sets are disjoint from E , each forcing condition p will have, as a side condition, a finite $I_p \subseteq E$ which is forced to be a subset of Q .

Define $p \in \mathbb{P}$ iff p is a triple $(\mathcal{T}, I, \varphi) = (\mathcal{T}_p, I_p, \varphi_p)$, such that:

- a. $\mathcal{T}$ is a nice tree of some finite height $h = h_p \geq 1$.
- b. I is finite and $I \subseteq E \cap \bigcup L_{h-1}(\mathcal{T})$.
- c. $\varphi : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \omega^{<\omega}$ with $\varphi(U) \in \omega^\ell$ for $U \in L_\ell(\mathcal{T})$.
- d. $\varphi(V) \supseteq \varphi(U)$ whenever $V \subseteq U$.

e. If $s = \varphi(U)$ then $A_s \cap U \neq \emptyset$ and $I_p \subseteq A_s$.

Define $q \leq p$ iff $\mathcal{T}_q$ is an end extension of $\mathcal{T}_p$ and $I_q \supseteq I_p$ and $\varphi_q \supseteq \varphi_p$. Then $\mathbb{1} = (\{X\}, \emptyset, \{(X, \emptyset)\})$. $\mathbb{P}$ is ccc (and σ -centered) because p, q are compatible whenever $\mathcal{T}_p = \mathcal{T}_q$ and $\varphi_p = \varphi_q$. If G is a filter meeting the dense sets $\{p : h_p > n\}$ for each n , then G defines a tree $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_G = \bigcup \{\mathcal{T}_p : p \in G\}$ of height ω , and $Q = Q_{\mathcal{T}}$ is a Cantor set. We also have $\varphi_G = \bigcup \{\varphi_p : p \in G\}$, so $\varphi_G : \mathcal{T}_G \rightarrow \omega^{<\omega}$; also, let $I_G = \bigcup \{I_p : p \in G\}$.

Note that for each $x \in E$, $\{p : x \in I_p \vee x \notin \bigcup L_{h_p-1}(\mathcal{T}_p)\}$ is dense in $\mathbb{P}$. If G meets all these dense sets, then $Q \cap E = I_G$. We may then let $K_j^n = Q \cap \bigcup \{U \in L_{n+1}(\mathcal{T}_G) : \varphi(U)(n) = j\}$.

Finally, if we list E as $\{e_\beta : \beta < \omega_1\}$, note that each set $\{p : \exists \beta > \alpha [e_\beta \in I_p]\}$ is dense, so that we may force $Q \cap E$ to be uncountable. ☕

Lemma 3.7 *Assume PFA. Assume that X is a Polish space, F is a compact metric space, $E \in [X]^{\aleph_1}$, $g \in C(X^\dagger, F)$, and $g(x, y) = g(y, x)$ whenever $x \neq y$. Then there is a Cantor set $Q \subseteq X$ such that $|Q \cap E| = \aleph_1$ and $g \upharpoonright Q^\dagger$ extends continuously to some $\hat{g} \in C(Q \times Q, F)$.*

Proof. For each n , we may use compactness of F to cover $X^\dagger$ by finitely many open sets, $W_i^n = (W_i^n)^{-1}$ for $i < \ell_n$, such that each $\text{diam}(g(W_i^n)) \leq 2^{-n}$. It follows by Theorem 3.5 that for each n , we may partition E into sets $\{A_j^n : j \in \omega\}$ such that each A_j^n is W_i^n -connected for some i , so that $\text{diam}(g((A_j^n)^\dagger)) \leq 2^{-n}$.

By Lemma 3.6, we have a Cantor set $Q \subseteq X$ and, for each n , a partition of Q into disjoint relatively clopen sets $\{K_j^n : j \in \omega\}$ such that $|Q \cap E| = \aleph_1$ and each $K_j^n \cap E = A_j^n \cap Q$. Shrinking Q , we may assume $Q \cap E$ is dense in Q , so that each $A_j^n \cap Q$ is dense in K_j^n and $\text{diam}(g((K_j^n)^\dagger)) \leq 2^{-n}$.

Now, fix $x \in Q$. For each n , x lies in exactly one of the K_j^n , and we may let $H^n = \text{cl}(g((K_j^n)^\dagger))$ for that j . Then $\bigcap_n H^n$ is a singleton, and we may define $\hat{g}$ on the diagonal by $\{\hat{g}(x, x)\} = \bigcap_n H^n$. It is easily seen that this $\hat{g}$ is continuous on $Q \times Q$. ☕

4 Proofs of Positive Results

Lemma 4.1 *Fix an uncountable $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$. Assuming SOCA, there is an uncountable $T \subseteq E$ such that T is ε -directed. In the case that E is Polish, this is a ZFC result and T can be made perfect.*

Proof. Let $\{V_i : i < \ell\}$ be an open cover of S^{n-1} by sets of diameter less than ε , and apply Lemma 3.3 with $W_i = \{(x, y) \in E^\dagger : \rho(x - y) \in V_i\}$. ☕

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Applying Lemma 4.1 and shrinking P , we may assume that P is a Cantor set and that P is $2 \sin(22.5^\circ)$ -directed; so, the direction between any two points of P is within 45° of some fixed direction. Rotating coordinates, we may assume that this fixed direction is along the x -axis, where we label our n axes as $x, y^1, \dots, y^{n-1}$. Now, P is (the graph of) a function which expresses $(y^1, \dots, y^{n-1})$ as a function of x , and $D := \text{dom}(P)$ is a Cantor set. Write $P(x)$ as $(P^1(x), \dots, P^{n-1}(x))$.

The xy^i -planar slopes of P are all in $[-1, 1]$. That is, for $x_1, x_2 \in D$ with $x_1 \neq x_2$, let $g^i(x_1, x_2) = (P^i(x_2) - P^i(x_1))/(x_2 - x_1)$; then $|g^i(x_1, x_2)| \leq 1$ for all x_1, x_2 . Each $g^i \in C(D^\dagger, [0, 1])$ and $g^i(x_1, x_2) = g^i(x_2, x_1)$ whenever $x_1 \neq x_2$. Applying Lemma 3.4 with $F = [0, 1]^{n-1}$ and shrinking D if necessary, we may assume that each g^i extends continuously to some $\hat{g}^i \in C(D \times D, [0, 1])$. Let $h^i(x) = \hat{g}^i(x, x)$. Then h^i is the derivative of P^i in the strong sense. Now, we may apply Lemma 2.3 on each coordinate separately to obtain a C^1 arc $A \supseteq P$; A is the graph of a C^1 function $x \mapsto (A^1(x), \dots, A^{n-1}(x))$ defined on an interval containing D . ☕

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Given Lemma 3.7, the proof is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 1.3. ☕

When $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ has size exactly $\aleph_1$, and the Question of Section 1 has a positive answer, it is natural to ask whether E can be covered by $\aleph_0$ “nice” arcs. For example, under $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$, E is covered by $\aleph_0$ Cantor sets, and hence by $\aleph_0$ arcs. One can also improve Theorem 1.2:

Theorem 4.2 *PFA implies every $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ of size $\aleph_1$ can be covered by $\aleph_0$ C^1 arcs.*

The proof mimics the proof of Theorem 1.2, but uses improved versions of Lemmas 4.1, 3.6 and 3.7. The new and improved Lemma 4.1 gets E covered by $\aleph_0$ ε -directed sets, using Theorem 3.5 rather than SOCA.

The covering versions of Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7 get Cantor sets $Q_\ell \subseteq X$ for $\ell \in \omega$ satisfying the conditions of the lemmas and so that $E \subseteq \bigcup_\ell Q_\ell$. To get the Q_ℓ for $\ell \in \omega$, force with the finite support product of ω copies of the poset $\mathbb{P}$ described in the proof of Lemma 3.6. Then, use the Q_ℓ to prove the covering version of Lemma 3.7. Even though the proof of Lemma 3.7 shrinks Q , it does so by deleting at most countably many points from E , so these points may be covered by $\aleph_0$ straight lines. Thus, E will be covered by $\bigcup_\ell Q_\ell$ together with a countable union of lines.

5 Proofs of Negative Results

Lemma 5.1 *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ be closed. Then there is an $h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $h(x) \geq 0$ for all x and $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : h(x) = 0\}$.*

Proof. Let $U = \mathbb{R} \setminus D$; we shall call our function h_U . If $U = (a, b)$, then such h_U are in standard texts; for example, let $h_{(a,b)}(x)$ be $\exp(-1 \div (x-a)(b-x))$ for $x \in (a, b)$ and 0 otherwise. Now, say $U = \bigcup_{n \in \omega} J_n$, where each J_n is a bounded open interval. Let $h_U = \sum_{n \in \omega} c_n h_{J_n}$, where each $c_n > 0$ and the c_n are small enough so that for each $\ell \in \omega$, the ℓ^{th} derivative $h_U^{(\ell)}$ is the uniform limit of the sum $\sum_{n \in \omega} c_n h_{J_n}^{(\ell)}$. ☕

Proof of Theorem 1.6. Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a Cantor set. Integrating the function of Lemma 5.1, fix $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $f'(x) \geq 0$ for all x and $D = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : f'(x) = 0\}$. Then f is strictly increasing.

Let P be the graph of $f \upharpoonright D$. Fix an uncountable $A \subseteq P$, and assume that A is non-squiggly; we shall derive a contradiction. Fix $\delta > 0$ as in Definition 1.4; then, shrinking A , we may assume that $\text{diam}(A) \leq \delta$ so that whenever $\{x, y, z, t\} \in [A]^4$, point t is not interior to triangle xyz .

Let S be an infinite subset of $\text{dom}(A)$ such that every point of S is a limit, from the left and right, of other points of S .

Now, fix $a, b, c \in S$ with $a < b < c$; then $f(a) < f(b) < f(c)$. Let L be the straight line passing through $(a, f(a))$ and $(c, f(c))$. Moving b slightly if necessary, we may assume (since $f'(b) = 0$) that L does not pass through $(b, f(b))$. Then either $L(b) > f(b)$ or $L(b) < f(b)$.

Suppose that $L(b) > f(b)$. Consider triangle $(a, f(a)), (b, f(b)), (c, f(c))$. One leg of this triangle is the graph of $L \upharpoonright [a, c]$, which passes above the point $(b, f(b))$. Since all three legs have positive slope and $f'(b) = 0$, the points $(b - \varepsilon, f(b - \varepsilon))$ are interior to the triangle when $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. Choosing such an ε with $b - \varepsilon \in S$ yields a contradiction.

$L(b) < f(b)$ is likewise contradictory, using points $(b + \varepsilon, f(b + \varepsilon))$. ☕

Observe that the arc in Theorem 1.6 cannot be real-analytic, since if $f : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is real-analytic, then $[0, 1]$ can be decomposed into finitely many intervals on which either $f'' \geq 0$ or $f'' \leq 0$. On each of these intervals, the graph of f is non-squiggly.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. As in the proof of Theorem 1.6, let $D \subset \mathbb{R}$ be a Cantor set, and fix $f \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that f is strictly increasing, $f'(y) \geq 0$ for all y , and $D = \{y \in \mathbb{R} : f'(y) = 0\}$. Also, to simplify notation, assume that $f(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}$, so that $\varphi := f^{-1} \in C(\mathbb{R})$ and is also a strictly increasing function. Let $K = f(D)$; so K is also a Cantor set. Then φ is C^∞ on $\mathbb{R} \setminus K$, and $\varphi'(x) = +\infty$ for $x \in K$. Integrating, fix $\psi \in C^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\psi' = \varphi$; so ψ is a convex function.

Note that whenever $x \in K$ and $M > 0$, there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\varphi'(u) \geq M$ whenever $|u - x| < \varepsilon$. When $x - \varepsilon < a \leq v \leq b < x + \varepsilon$, we can integrate this to get $\varphi(a) + M(v - a) \leq \varphi(v) \leq \varphi(b) - M(b - v)$. Integrating again yields

$$(b - a)\varphi(a) + (b - a)^2 M/2 \leq \psi(b) - \psi(a) \leq (b - a)\varphi(b) - (b - a)^2 M/2 .$$

This implies that, for $x \in K$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{(\psi(x + t) - \psi(x))/t - \varphi(x)}{t} = +\infty ; \quad (*)$$

the argument can be broken into two cases: $t \searrow 0$ (consider $a = x < x + t = b$) and $t \nearrow 0$ (consider $a = x + t < x = b$).

Now let $P = \psi \upharpoonright K$; so P is a Cantor set in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Suppose that P meets the C^2 arc A in an infinite set. Since the intersection is compact, it contains a limit point (x_0, y_0) . At (x_0, y_0) , the tangent to the arc A is parallel to the tangent of the C^1 arc $y = \psi(x)$; in particular, this tangent is not vertical. Thus, replacing A by a segment thereof, we may assume that A is the arc $y = \xi(x)$, where ξ is a C^2 function defined in some neighborhood of x_0 . Now $y_0 = \xi(x_0) = \psi(x_0)$ and $\xi'(x_0) = \psi'(x_0) = \varphi(x_0)$. Also, since (x_0, y_0) is a limit point of the intersection, there are non-zero t_k , for $k \in \omega$, converging to 0, such that each $\psi(x_0 + t_k) = \xi(x_0 + t_k)$. Applying Taylor's Theorem to ξ ,

$$\psi(x_0 + t_k) = \psi(x_0) + \varphi(x_0)t_k + \frac{1}{2}\xi''(z_k)t_k^2 \text{ for some } z_k \text{ between } x_0 \text{ and } x_0 + t_k .$$

Since $\xi''(z_k) \rightarrow \xi''(x_0)$, we have

$$[(\psi(x_0 + t_k) - \psi(x_0))/t_k - \varphi(x_0)]/t_k \rightarrow \xi''(x_0)/2 ,$$

contradicting (*). ☕

If ψ were C^2 , the limit in (*) would be $\psi''(x)/2 \neq \infty$ (by Taylor's Theorem). Moreover, the Cantor set $P = \psi \upharpoonright K$ meets *any* C^2 arc in a finite set. This illustrates a difference between C^1 and C^2 : rotation can cure an infinite derivative, but not an infinite second derivative. Even though $\varphi'(x) = \infty$ for $x \in K$, rotating the graph of $\varphi \upharpoonright K$ gives us the graph of $f \upharpoonright D$, which lies on a C^∞ arc.

6 Remarks on Arcs

Although the notion of *strongly* C^k is the one capturing the geometric notion of “smooth”, every polygonal path is weakly C^∞ . Moreover, the standard formulas for

evaluating line integrals (e.g., $\int_A \vec{\Phi}(\vec{x}) \cdot d\vec{x} = \int_a^b \vec{\Phi}(\vec{g}(t)) \cdot \vec{g}'(t) dt$) only require the path $\vec{g}(t)$ to be *weakly* C^1 ; the arc A may have corners, with the velocity vector $\vec{g}'(t)$ becoming zero at a corner.

Theorems 1.2, 1.3, and 1.6 produce *strongly* C^k arcs. In contrast, Theorem 1.5 produces a perfect set which *meets* all strongly C^2 arcs in a finite set. Theorem 1.7 shows that the *weakly* version of this theorem is false.

To prove Theorem 1.7, we begin with an interpolation result.

Definition 6.1 *An interpolation function is a $\psi \in C([0, 1], [0, 1])$ such that $\psi(0) = 0$ and $\psi(1) = 1$.*

Definition 6.2 *Assume that D is a closed subset of $[0, 1]$ with $0, 1 \in D$. Fix $g \in C(D, \mathbb{R}^n)$, and let ψ be an interpolation function. Then the ψ interpolation for g is the function $\tilde{g} \in C([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ extending g such that whenever (a, b) is a maximal interval in $[0, 1] \setminus D$ and $u \in (a, b)$,*

$$\tilde{g}(u) = g(a) + (g(b) - g(a))\psi((u - a)/(b - a)) \quad .$$

It is easily seen that $\tilde{g}$ is indeed continuous on $[0, 1]$.

Definition 6.3 *Assume that D is a closed subset of $[0, 1]$ with $0, 1 \in D$. Then $g \in C(D, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is flat iff for all $\alpha \in \omega$, there is a bound M_α such that for all $u, t \in D$ $\|g(u) - g(t)\| \leq M_\alpha |u - t|^\alpha$.*

That is, g is flat iff for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N} = \omega \setminus \{0\}$, g is uniformly Lipschitz of order α on D . If D is finite, then every $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is flat. If D contains an interval, then a flat g is constant on that interval, because it is Lipschitz of order 2 there; for $t < t + h$ in the interval: $\|g(t + h) - g(t)\| \leq k \cdot M_2 \cdot h^2/k^2$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Lemma 6.4 *Assume that D is a closed subset of $[0, 1]$ with $0, 1 \in D$. Assume that $g \in C(D, \mathbb{R}^n)$ is flat. Let ψ be an interpolation function such that $\psi \in C^\infty([0, 1], [0, 1])$ and $\psi^{(k)}(0) = \psi^{(k)}(1) = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\tilde{g}$ be the ψ interpolation for g . Then $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\tilde{g}^{(k)}(t) = 0$ for all $t \in D$ and all $k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to produce bounds B_k giving the following Lipschitz condition for all $t \in D$ and $u \notin D$:

1. $\|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(t)\| \leq B_0 |u - t|^2$.
2. $\|\tilde{g}^{(k)}(u)\| \leq B_k |u - t|^2$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note that (1)(2) fail for $u, t \notin D$, since the derivatives there need not be 0. On the other hand, (1) holds for $u, t \in D$, because g is flat.

Observe that (1) and 2-Lipschitz on D prove $\tilde{g}'(t) = 0$ for $t \in D$, so that (2) makes $\tilde{g} \in C^1([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$. For $k \geq 2$, induct on k to see that $\tilde{g} \in C^{(k)}([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$: (2) for $k-1$ and the fact that $\tilde{g}^{(k-1)}$ is 2-Lipschitz on D prove $\tilde{g}^{(k)}(t) = 0$ for $t \in D$, so (2) for k makes $g^{(k)}$ continuous.

To prove (1)(2), assume, without loss of generality, $t < u$. To handle (1)(2) together, let $Q_0(u, t) = \|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(t)\|$, and for $k > 0$, $Q_k(u, t) = \|\tilde{g}^{(k)}(u)\|$. Consider the two cases:

Case I. $(t, u) \cap D = \emptyset$: Say $t = a < u < b$, where $a, b \in D$ and (a, b) is a maximal interval in $[0, 1] \setminus D$. So

$$Q_k(u, t) = \|g(b) - g(a)\| \cdot \left| \psi^{(k)} \left(\frac{u-a}{b-a} \right) \right| \cdot \frac{1}{(b-a)^k} .$$

Let S_k be the largest value taken by the function $|\psi^{(k)}|$. Consider:

Subcase I.1. $(b-a)^2 \leq (u-a)$: Here,

$$Q_k(u, t) \leq \|g(b) - g(a)\| \cdot S_k \cdot \frac{1}{(b-a)^k} \cdot \frac{(u-a)^2}{(u-a)^2} \leq M_{k+4} S_k (u-a)^2 .$$

Subcase I.2. $(b-a)^2 \geq (u-a)$: In this case, use Taylor's Theorem and the assumption $\psi^{(n)}(0) = 0$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, to bound $|\psi^{(k)}(z)|$ by $\frac{S_{2k+4}}{(k+4)!} z^4$. Then,

$$Q_k(u, t) \leq M_0 \cdot \left| \psi^{(k)} \left(\frac{u-a}{b-a} \right) \right| \cdot \frac{(b-a)^{k+4}}{(u-a)^{k+4}} \cdot \frac{(u-a)^{k+4}}{(b-a)^{2k+4}} \leq M_0 \cdot \frac{S_{2k+4}}{(k+4)!} \cdot (u-a)^2 .$$

Case II. $(t, u) \cap D \neq \emptyset$: Let $a = \sup(D \cap [t, u])$, so $t < a < u$ and Case I applies to a, u . For (1), use the fact that g is flat, together with

$$\|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(t)\| \leq \|\tilde{g}(u) - \tilde{g}(a)\| + \|g(a) - g(t)\| .$$

For (2), $\|\tilde{g}^{(k)}(u)\| \leq B_k |u-a|^2 \leq B_k |u-t|^2$. ☕

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Passing to a subset, and possibly translating it, let $E = \{\vec{x}_j : j \in \omega\}$, where the $\vec{x}_j$ converge to $\vec{0}$, and

- a. $\|\vec{x}_0\| > \|\vec{x}_1\| > \|\vec{x}_2\| > \dots$.
- b. $\|\vec{x}_j\| \leq 2^{-j^2}$ for each j .

Let A be the set obtained by connecting each $\vec{x}_j$ to $\vec{x}_{j+1}$ by a straight line segment; so A is a “polygonal” arc, with ω steps. Moreover, the natural path which traverses it from $\vec{0}$ to $\vec{x}_0$ will be 1-1, because (a) guarantees that the line segments forming A meet only at the $\vec{x}_j$. Let $D = \{0\} \cup \{2^{-j} : j \in \omega\}$, and define $g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ by $g(0) = \vec{0}$ and $g(2^{-j}) = \vec{x}_j$. Then g is flat, by (b) (with $M_\alpha = 2^{1+\alpha+\alpha^2}$).

Let $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be such that

- ☞ $\psi(t) = 0$ when $t \leq 0$ and $\psi(t) = 1$ when $t \geq 1$.
- ☞ $\psi'(t) > 0$ for $0 < t < 1$.
- ☞ $\psi^{(k)}(0) = \psi^{(k)}(1) = 0$ for $k \geq 1$.

Such a ψ may be obtained by integrating a scalar multiple of the function described in Lemma 5.1. Let $\tilde{g} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be the ψ interpolation for g . Then, by Lemma 6.4, $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$. ☕

For the path $\tilde{g}$ in the preceding proof, all $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$ (for $k \geq 1$) will be $\vec{0}$ when passing through each $\vec{x}_j$, so that no acceleration is felt when rounding a corner. Also, each $\tilde{g}^{(k)}$ will be $\vec{0}$ at $t = 0$.

Now consider the perfect set version.

Theorem 6.5 *If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is Borel and uncountable, then E meets some weakly C^∞ arc in an uncountable set.*

Proof. Write elements of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as $\vec{x} = (x^1, \dots, x^n)$. By shrinking and rotating E , we may assume that E is a Cantor set and the projection π^1 of E on the x^1 coordinate is 1-1. Shrinking E further, we may assume that $E = \bigcap_j (\bigcup \{F_\sigma : \sigma \in \{0, 2\}^j\})$, where the F_σ are compact and form a tree and each $\text{diam}(F_\sigma) \leq 3^{-(\text{lh}(\sigma))^2}$.

In $\mathbb{R}$, the “ t -axis”, let D be the usual middle-third Cantor set. Then $D = \bigcap_j (\bigcup \{I_\sigma : \sigma \in \{0, 2\}^j\})$, where I_σ is an interval of length $3^{-\text{lh}(\sigma)}$. Let $g : D \rightarrow E$ be the natural homeomorphism. So, if $\alpha \in \{0, 2\}^\omega$, it determines the point $t_\alpha = \sum_{i \in \omega} (\alpha_i 3^{-i}) \in D$. Then $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} I_{\alpha \upharpoonright i} = \{t_\alpha\}$ and $\bigcap_{i \in \omega} F_{\alpha \upharpoonright i} = \{g(t_\alpha)\}$.

Note that g is flat. Let $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be as in the proof of Theorem 1.7, and let $\tilde{g}$ be the ψ interpolation for g . Then $\tilde{g} \in C^\infty([0, 1], \mathbb{R}^n)$.

Finally, in choosing E and the F_σ , make sure that if $\sigma < \tau$ lexicographically, then all elements of $\pi^1(F_\sigma)$ are less than all elements of $\pi^1(F_\tau)$. This will guarantee that $\pi^1 \circ g : D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is order-preserving, so that $\tilde{g}$ is a 1-1 function. ☕

Under $\text{MA}(\aleph_1)$, if $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ has size $\aleph_1$, then E can be covered by $\aleph_0$ weakly C^∞ arcs. In particular, E can be covered by $\aleph_0$ copies, or rotated copies, of the perfect set $g(D)$ constructed in the preceding proof.

References

- [1] U. Abraham, M. Rubin, and S. Shelah, On the consistency of some partition theorems for continuous colorings, and the structure of $\aleph_1$ -dense real order types, *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic* 29 (1985) 123-206.
- [2] F. Galvin, Partition theorems for the real line, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.* 15 (1968) 660.
- [3] K. Kunen, Locally connected HL compacta, to appear.
- [4] J. T. Moore, Open colorings, the continuum and the second uncountable cardinal, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 130 (2002) 2753-2759.